

**Certificate of Master Study Committee
Meeting Minutes
November 28, 2000**

Members Present

Gary Gainer, Nick Brossoit, Barbara Clausen, Carly Cyr, Lynn Fielding, Marc Frazer, Don Hanson, Linda Hernandez, Denny Hurtado, Cheryl Mayo, Steve Mullin, Marv Sather, Chris Thompson (for Patrick Patrick), Dennis Wallace, Andy Wheeler, Jan Yoshiwara (for Tom Koenninger)

Members Unable to Attend

Terry Densley, Rosemary Fitton, Gary Kipp, Bob McMullen, Rich Nafziger, Gay Selby

State Board Staff Present

Larry Davis, Pat Eirish

Guests Present

Brian Barker, Rainer Houser

Call to Order

Larry Davis brought the meeting to order at 3:25 p.m. (NOTE: Mr. Gainer's flight was delayed.)

Approval of Minutes

It was moved by Lynn Fielding and seconded by Nick Brossoit to approve the minutes from the September 28, 2000 meeting with the following amendments adding to the list of topics for upcoming meetings: 1.) Discuss alternative assessment options and possibilities, and 2.) Discuss incentives for students to do well on the WASL. Motion carried.

**Status Report and Discussion on Federal Requirement for Special Education
Alternative Assessment (3:38^{pm})**

Cheryl Mayo gave a status report on the federal requirement for alternative assessment of special education students. It was stated that the Office of Civil Rights made a ruling against differentiated diplomas. (NOTE: A copy of the ruling will be obtained.) The ensuing discussion and questions led to the following clarifications:

- The special education standard will not drive the non-special education standard because it is two completely different categories of students.
- The special education alternative assessment will apply to only about one percent of all special education students.

- The purpose of the federal requirement is that if the student cannot be assessed by regular means, the student must be assessed in an alternative way that will show some level of growth by the student.
- The alternative assessment will be in the form of a portfolio.

Unresolved Issues:

- To what extent should/will there be comparability/alignment between the content of the portfolio and the content of the test?
- Special education students above the one percent group, if they don't earn the Certificate of Mastery by passing the WASL 10, but do complete a portfolio, will they get a diploma?

Discussion regarding proposed study groups (4:00^{pm})

Mr. Gainer shared some remarks about the suggestion to divide the committee into two study groups and invited discussion. The committee decided to continue to operate as a full group. Focus should be on the fundamental mission of the committee. The group was reminded that the State Board has an obligation to implement the law (see below) and needs to give its best faith effort toward giving the law a chance to work. To this end, the committee is obligated to be sure it has looked subjectively and positively at what is working and not working.

RCW 28A.655.060(3)(c) After a determination is made
education that the high school assessment system has been implemented and that it is
sufficiently reliable and valid, successful completion of the high school assessment
ery shall be required for
graduation but shall not be the only requirement for graduation.”

General Discussion (5:00^{pm})

- How big a brush is “valid and reliable?”
- The committee needs talking points on validity and reliability.
- Define validity and reliability for Washington State purposes.
- Need assistance/guidance from the State Superintendent's state and national Technical Advisory Committees to develop the criteria upon which a reasonable decision can be made about validity and reliability.

General Discussion (continued)

- Are adults prepared to deliver that for which students will be held accountable?
- Who is the audience we are trying to affect? Lawmakers? Business community?
- Does passing cut-scores ensure reasonable student proficiency and are they reliable?
- Are there other EALRs not on the test that should be included?
- What is reasonable? Keep in mind practical and reasonable is not necessarily valid and reliable. It may be valid and reliable, but is it reasonable? The purpose of education reform is to improve education.
- Have students been provided the opportunity to learn?
- There is confusion regarding the difference between assessment and standard.

- Should the WASL be the only means to earn the CoM?
- Need at least one, credible, alternate means of earning the CoM.
- What will the state and districts do with students who do not earn the CoM?
- Should the test and Essential Academic Learning Requirements be the only measurements that are used to make sure kids graduate? Continue to measure the test.

Dinner Break (5:35^{pm})

Committee Mission and Goals (6:00^{pm})

It was moved by Dennis Wallace and seconded by Andy Wheeler to adopt WAC 180-51-064(3) as the mission statement for the Certificate of Mastery Committee. It reads: "The advisory committee shall examine and make recommendations to the state board of education on validity and reliability issues and conduct a review and analysis of the requirement that students obtain a certificate as a condition for high school graduation." Motion carried.

The committee discussed and agreed on the following goals:

1. Make a recommendation to the State Board of Education about the validity and reliability of the secondary WASL.
2. Make recommendations to the State Board of Education regarding an evaluation of the readiness of the system to support the secondary WASL as a graduation requirement.

3. Make recommendations to the State Board of Education regarding what to do for students who cannot pass the WASL.

Other Actions (6:30^{pm})

- A status report will be given to the 2001 Legislature. Larry Davis will e-mail that report to the committee members prior to being presented to the Legislature.
- It was suggested that the national and state Technical Advisory Committees make a presentation(s) to the committee.
- It was suggested that a method of self-evaluation be developed as the committee continues.
- Keep an open process for individuals to comment.
- Staff was requested to develop a draft work plan for consideration at the next meeting.
- The next meeting date is January 30 from 3:00^{pm} to 7:00^{pm} at the Burien OSPI Conference Center.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10^{pm}.